



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/516,402	03/01/2000	Neta Amit	1018.072US1	2983

23460 7590 12/01/2003

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD  
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900  
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE  
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780

EXAMINER

NORRIS, TREMAYNE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/516,402

Applicant(s)

AMIT ET AL.

Examiner

Tremayne M. Norris

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1,3-10,11-15,17-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jiang et al.

Regarding Claim 1, Jiang et al teach a computer-implemented method comprising: sending a request for network account credentials from an originating account associated with an unpublished object (col.2 lines 18-19; col.4 lines 2-5; col.5 lines 10-15) to a dispatch associated with a published object (col.2 lines 29-32), the request sent to the published object associated with the dispatch includes identification of the unpublished object associated with the originating account; authenticating the originating account at the dispatch; and, upon authenticating the originating account, sending an emblem (col.8 lines 52-59; col.10 lines 9-12) for a network account to the originating account, the emblem sent to the unpublished object associated with the originating account and having the identification as included with the request (Figs. 1-4; col.1 line 63 thru col.2 line 48; col.3 line 59 thru col.4 line 15).

Regarding Claim 3, Jiang et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein each of the published object and the unpublished object comprises a message queue (Figs. 1-4; col.2 lines 18-19; col.4 lines 2-5; col.5 lines 10-15; col.2 lines 29-32).

Regarding Claim 4, Jiang et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein each of the published object and the unpublished object comprises a file (Figs. 1-4; col.1 line 63 thru col.2 line 48; col.3 line 59 thru col.4 line 15).

Regarding Claim 5, Jiang et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein the emblem comprises a token (col.8 lines 52-59; col.10 lines 9-12).

Regarding Claim 6, Jiang et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein the network account for which the emblem is sent from the dispatch to the originating account comprises a batch account of the dispatch (Figs. 1-4; col.1 line 63 thru col.2 line 48; col.3 line 59 thru col.4 line 15).

Regarding Claim 7, Jiang et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein sending an emblem for the network account to the originating account comprises remoting the batch account to the originating account, such that the emblem comprises an emblem for the batch account (Figs. 1-4; col.1 line 63 thru col.2 line 48; col.3 line 59 thru col.4 line 15).

Regarding Claim 8, Jiang et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein the network account for which the emblem is sent from the dispatch to the originating account comprises an agent account of an agent (Figs. 1-4; col.1 line 63 thru col.2 line 48; col.3 line 59 thru col.4 line 15).

Regarding Claim 9, Jiang et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein sending an emblem for the network account to the originating account comprises:

- proxy logging on to the agent;

- remoting the agent account to the originating account upon proxy log on to the agent, such that the emblem comprises an emblem for the agent account (Figs. 1-4; col.1 line 63 thru col.2 line 48; col.3 line 59 thru col.4 line 15; col.8 lines 12-15).

Regarding Claim 11, Jiang et al teach a computer-implemented method comprising: sending an unencrypted request for network account credentials from an originating account to a dispatch; authenticating the originating account at the dispatch; upon authenticating the originating account, proxy logging on to an agent account; and, transmitting an emblem including network account credentials for one of the

agent account and a batch account back to the originating account to satisfy the request for network account credentials sent from the originating account (Figs. 1-4; col.1 line 63 thru col.2 line 48; col.3 line 59 thru col.4 line 15; col.8 lines 12-15).

Claims 12-15 are rejected for similar rationale outlined above.

Regarding Claim 17, Jiang et al teach a computerized system comprising:  
a plurality of network accounts, each account capable of being proxy logged onto and of being remoted to another account; and,

a dispatch designed to field requests for network account credentials from the plurality of accounts, and to satisfy each request for network account credentials from an originating account by proxy logging onto an account capable of being proxy logged onto such that credentials for the account are remoted back to the originating account as the network account credentials requested (Figs. 1-4; col.1 line 63 thru col.2 line 48; col.3 line 59 thru col.4 line 15; col.11 line 65 thru col.12 line 2; col.8 lines 12-15).

Claims 18-21 are system claims that are equivalent to rejected method claims 1-9 and 11-15. Therefore claims 18-21 are rejected under similar rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Burns et al. Jiang et al teach of an emblem but do not teach that the emblem is encrypted. Burns et al teach of the usage of encrypted emblems in a remotely encrypted file system (col.3 lines 10-25; col.5 lines 25-31). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Jiang et al's emblem with burn's et al teachings of using encrypted emblems in order to prevent eavesdroppers from viewing and altering the content of requested information that is being transmitted over the network (col. 1 lines 45-59; col.2 line 14-17; col.2 lines 24-26).

Claims 10 and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang et al as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Schmeidler et al. Jiang et al teach the method of claim 1, however, fail to teach that the emblem is expirable, such that the method further comprises determining whether the emblem is about to expire, and upon so determining, renewing the emblem with a renewing

authority. Schmeidler et al does teach that the emblem is expirable, such that the method further comprises determining whether the emblem is about to expire, and upon so determining, renewing the emblem with a renewing authority (col.24 line 60 thru col.25 line 24). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Jiang et al's method of accessing data with Schmeidler et al's teaching of using tokens that expire in order to further enhance the security of the content received through on-line demand by preventing unauthorized use and copying (col.2 lines 19-26).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tremayne M. Norris whose telephone number is (703) 305-8045. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM-5:00PM alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (703) 305-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Tremayne Norris

November 21, 2003

*Matthew P. Smithers*  
**MATTHEW SMITHERS**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
*Art Unit 2134*